

NOT FOR PULICATION

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

AAKASH DALAL,

Plaintiff,

v.

CLEARVIEW AI, INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 24-10380 (SDW) (AME)

ORDER

June 20, 2025

WIGENTON, District Judge.

Before this Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) entered on May 1, 2025, by Magistrate Judge André M. Espinosa (D.E. 14) recommending granting Defendant Clearview AI, Inc.’s motion to dismiss the complaint pursuant to Rule 12(b)(2) (D.E. 6). This Court has reviewed the reasons set forth in the R&R by Judge Espinosa.¹ Based on the foregoing, and for good cause shown, it is hereby

ORDERED that the R&R of Judge Espinosa (D.E. 14) is **ADOPTED** as the conclusion of law of this Court; and it is further

ORDERED that Defendant’s motion to dismiss (D.E. 6) is **GRANTED**, and the complaint is **DISMISSED**.²

¹ No objection to the R&R was filed.

² The complaint also named fictional Defendants. “[F]or a court to have diversity of citizenship jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, a plaintiff ‘must specifically allege each party’s citizenship, [and show] that the plaintiff and [each] defendant are citizens of different states.’” *Foster v. Pitney Bowes Corp.*, Civ. No. 11-7303, 2013 WL 487196, at *10 (E.D. Pa. Feb. 8, 2013) (third alteration in original) (quoting *Osuch v. Optima Mach. Corp.*, Civ. No. 10-6101, 2011 WL 2708464, at *1 (E.D. Pa. July 12, 2011)), *supplemented*, Civ. No. 11-7303, 2013 WL 1500683 (E.D. Pa. Apr. 12, 2013), and *aff’d*, 549 F. App’x 982 (Fed. Cir. 2013). Plaintiff has not done so with regard to the fictional Defendants, so the complaint is dismissed in its entirety. *See id.* (dismissing John Doe defendants whose citizenship was not alleged).

SO ORDERED.

/s/ Susan D. Wigenton
SUSAN D. WIGENTON, U.S.D.J.

Orig: Clerk
cc: Parties
André M. Espinosa, U.S.M.J.